

To Whom It May Concern:

While the new technology requires tremendous capital expenditures, I believe it is reasonable for agency such as the FCC to take a time out and monitor the evolving VRS technology field. However, I do not think it was such a good idea for the agency to drastically cut the fundings, thus severely limiting the emergence of technology, setting back the telecommunication growth potential back to the "stone age." Granted, it is understood that the per minute is prohibitively expensive, however, I would wish that FCC would consult the appropriate organizations providing the said service for their accounting sheets and glance at the figures, i.e. the amount spent on the service, the personnel involved and others. This would serve to better gauge the expenditures.

I personally have been utilizing the service and found that it has cut down on the time of conversation. What would have taken me approximately 30 minutes on the traditional relay service and countless confusions based on the operator's limited vocabulary skills and impersonal tone, the VRS has cut down to approximately 7 minutes per conversation and has greatly enhanced the understanding between me and the hearing person on the other end, as I am able to ascertain what exactly the other person are discussing. Many of my clients, friends and relatives have commented that they love the VRS because of its simplicity, ease of conversation and understandings.

Since the FCC has cut the rate, I have found a significant time delay in waiting for the next available VRS interpreter, which forced me to utilize the inferior relay service to continue my transactions and contacts.

It is my hope that the FCC strike a reasonable balance of reasonable funding that would help the technology prosper and expand, serving the consumers across the nation. I, for one example, do not mind the inclusion of small surcharge on my telephone bill, to support the service.

Regards,

Erick H. Posner